

**REMARKS**

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed May 23, 2003. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-20 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-20.

**Specification**

As requested by the Examiner, the Specification has been amended to include the serial numbers and status of all co-pending patent applications.

**Claim Objections**

Claim 19 has been objected to because of informalities. Applicants have amended Claim 19 as suggested by the Examiner.

**Section 103 Rejections**

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-3, 5-12, and 14-20 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,539,237 to Sayers et al. ("*Sayers*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,411 to Kumaki et al. ("*Kumaki*"), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,292,829 to Huang et al. ("*Huang*"). Claims 4 and 13 are rejected as being unpatentable over *Sayers* in view of *Kumaki*, further in view of *Huang*, and further in view of Newton's Telecom Dictionary, 13th Edition ("*Newton*"). Applicants traverse these rejections and all assertions therein for the reasons discussed below.

Claim 1 is patentable because a combination of *Sayers*, *Kumaki*, and *Huang*, is improper, and does not teach all of the elements of Claim 1. For example, there is no suggestion to modify *Sayers* to add CMIP as suggested in the Office Action. The Office Action cites no teaching that the SNMP taught in *Sayers* is not used to manage the wireless network as well as the private network in *Sayers* and therefore there is no need for another management protocol (i.e., CMIP). Modifying *Sayers* to add CMIP would thus add cost and complexity without providing any benefit. Accordingly, there is no suggestion to combine the references and Claim 1 is patentable.

Independent Claims 10 and 16 are allowable for analogous reasons. Additionally, dependent claims 2-9, 11-15, and 17-20, which depend from Claims 1, 10, and 16, respectively, are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

If the present application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained, Applicants hereby request a telephone conference with the Examiner and further request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule the telephone conference.

Applicants do not believe that any fees are due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179 of Siemens Corporation.

Date: August 22, 2003

Respectfully requested,

SIEMENS CORPORATION  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830  
ATTENTION: Elsa Keller, IP Department  
Telephone: (732) 321-3026

By: Thomas George  
Thomas George  
Registration No. 45,740  
Attorney for Applicants  
Tel: 650-694-5191  
Fax: 650-968-4517